REMARKS

Applicant respectfully traverses and requests reconsideration.

Claims 16-19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Number 6,943,667 to Kammer et. al. ("Kammer"). Claim 16 has been amended. Kammer is directed to a method and a system for data transmission between a trusted first electronic device and a second electronic device. Transmission of data between the two devices occurs while a microprocessor in a second device is in a sleep mode and the wireless transceiver of the second device is in a wake mode. Kammer does not teach or suggest, among other things, receiving an independent power supply to power a remote connector nor a remote connector that includes a plurality of input ports capable of receiving a peripheral connector. In Kammer, the first electronic device transmits data signals and the second electronic device detects the transmitted signal. An interrupt signal is generated by a baseband processor in the transceiver of the second device to wake up the microprocessor in the second electronic device to its capability. (See Abstract, Column 2, Lines 1-52). More specifically, Kammer is directed to devices that may take the form of a transceiver circuit and a processing circuit. The transceiver circuit comprises an antennae, a baseband processor 270, and a communication port 260. When the remote device transmits a signal (see element 200 of Fig. 2) transceiver circuit 250 receives the signal and transmits it to the baseband processor 270 to determine if the signal is a connection attempt. The baseband processor 270 is coupled to the communication port 260 and determines: (a) if the communication port 260 is closed; and (b) if signal 201 is transmitted by a trusted device. (See Column 5, Line 62 – Column 6, Line 18). The communication port 260 serves as an input/output port with a microprocessor.

If the communication port 260 is closed and signal 201 is from a trusted device, baseband processor 270 toggles an outside line 235 which causes a generation of an interrupt signal. The

interrupt signal is then transmitted to microprocessor 220 via an interrupt line 240 which in turn causes a microprocessor 220 to wake up to its full operational capacity. Thereafter, a communication protocol is involved to cause the communication port 260 to open and receive data signal 201. If, however, port 260 was already open when the message was received, the interrupt signal is still generated to wake up microprocessor 220. Once wakened, it receives a message from the open port. (Column 6, Line 19 – 44). While Kammer appears to teach communication port that may be open or closed, Kammer is silent as to providing, by the remote connector, at least one input port capable of receiving a peripheral component.

As to claim 16, Applicant has amended the claim to clarify that the method includes receiving an independent power supply to power a remote connector and also providing, by the remote connector, a plurality of input ports each capable of receiving a peripheral connector. (See for example, Specification, page 14, paragraph 41 and elsewhere). The office action cites column 8, lines 45-47 as allegedly teaching receiving a power supply to power a remote connector and states that element 310 of Kammer, which is the transceiver, is the remote connector and that 310 requires powering. However, the cited portion does not teach or suggest receiving an independent power supply to the transceiver. In fact, it appears silent as to where the transceiver obtains its power. Since the reference does not teach or suggest the claimed subject matter, Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance.

In addition, the claim requires providing, by the remote connector, a plurality of input ports each capable of receiving a peripheral connector. The office action appears to confuse reference numbers and figure numbers in the rejection. For example, the office action refers to 210 as being a peripheral connector that connects to peripheral devices such as 105 and 106. However, 210 is not a connector but instead, as stated in Kammer is a "device circuit 210".

Accordingly, Kammer does not teach what is alleged. In addition, for argument sake, Kammer also fails to teach that the remote connector 310 provides a plurality of input ports each capable of receiving a peripheral connector. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the claim is in condition for allowance.

Claims 17 – 19 depend upon allowable claim 16 and are further believed to add additional novel and non-obvious subject matter. For the aforementioned reasons, claims 17 – 19 are also believed to be improper condition for allowance.

Claims 1 – 8 and 20 – 23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's admitted prior art in view of Kammer. Specifically, the office action states that Applicant's prior art teaches: (1) a plurality of input ports; (2) a power supply input receiver operatively coupled to a power source and being capable of receiving a power supply for power in the remote connector; and (3) a wireless receiver capable of wirelessly receiving a wireless command. The office further states that Kammer teaches a remote connector comprising: (1) a wireless receiver capable of wirelessly receiving a wireless command; (2) a transmitter capable of generating a wake up command in response to the wireless command and capable of providing a wake up command through an input/output interface to a processing unit operatively coupled to the remote connector. The office states that it would have been obvious for one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Applicant's submission of prior art and Kammer since that would allow the computer systems to receive messages while the receiving device is in a sleep mode. The office cites Column 1, Line 63 – 67 of Kammer to support this statement.

Before addressing what appears to be the office's impermissible hindsight reconstruction of Applicant's admitted prior art and Kammer, Applicant respectfully note that its admitted prior

art appears to be mischaracterized and is directed to two separate individual embodiments: (1) a USB hub and (2) an RF remote receiver. The USB hub consists of multiple USB ports coupled to a central internal bus which in turn is coupled to a USB port of a computing system. Applicant teaches that prior art USB hubs are powered through a variety of sources and allow for the connectivity of a variety of peripheral components such as, but not limited to, a printer, a mouse, a joystick, a keyboard or a display device. The second and separate embodiment disclosed in Applicant's admitted prior art is that of the remote receiver. As described therein, the remote receiver is coupled to a USB port of a computing system that is capable of receiving wireless command signals from a remote device. Applicant describes that the wireless receiver is typically powered through the connecting port and therefore is affected by a power mode of the computer system. Plus, Applicant respectfully notes that it is improper to characterize Applicant's disclosure as teaching that the first and second embodiments of its background are admittedly prior art as one and the same devices. In contrast, Applicant describes two separate devices that independently existed and were not believed in any way to be the invention hereof.

Addressing the office action's motivation to combine the teaching of Applicant's submission of prior art in Kammer, Applicant respectfully submits that one having ordinary skill in the art would not have been motivated to combine or otherwise incorporate the above teachings without impermissively using Applicant's background as a blueprint to do so.

For example, Kammer teaches a different system that appears to employ a power system for the transceiver which is the same as that for the processing device and as such, teaches a different approach from employing an independent power supply (see for example, claim 10).

In addition, as to claim 1, Kammer also fails to teach the plurality of input ports and a power supply input receiver as claimed as no power supply input receiver appears to be taught or

suggested in Kammer. As such, combining Kammer with an embodiment that also fails to incorporate such structure would still fail to teach or suggest such combination. It appears that it is Applicant's own claims that have been used as the basis for selecting different teachings of differing portions of the prior art in an effort to render Applicant's claim obvious.

In addition, for example, with respect to claim 3, the claim requires that the remote connector include a suspend mode detector capable of receiving a suspend mode indicator from the processing unit such that the transmitter can determine if the wake up command needs to be generated. Kammer has cited in particular elements 520 and 532. However, as noted in step 532, it is the "network circuit" that determines if the communication port is open and the microprocessor is awake – not the alleged remote connector 310 of Kammer. Accordingly, Kammer does not teach what is suggested and the claim is in condition for allowance.

Applicant respectfully submits that the dependent claims add additional novel and non-obvious subject matter.

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. The Examiner is invited to contact the below listed attorney if the Examiner believes that a telephone conference will advance the prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 11/20/06

By: _____
Christopher J. Reckamp
Registration No. 34,414

Vedder, Price, Kaufman & Kammholz, P.C.
222 North LaSalle Street, Suite 2600
Chicago, Illinois 60601
phone: (312) 609-7599
fax: (312) 609-5005